25

26

# **NEW APPLICATION**

BEFORE THE ARIZONA O	CORPORATION COMMISSION
	- iP
COMMISSIONERS	
ROBERT "BOB" BURNS - Chairman	
BOYD DUNN	
SANDRA D. KENNEDY	
JUSTIN OLSON LEA MÁRQUEZ PETERSON	
In the matter of:	DOCKET NO. S-21091A-19-0332
NULLIAN ACTIVIDATION NULLIAN MEDICAL NEL META	NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING
WILLIAM MELVIN HAWKINS a.k.a. MEL) HAWKINS (CRD# 831356),	REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER FOR
BIOMED PHARMA GROUP, INC., a ) Panama corporation, )	RESTITUTION, AND ORDER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES
Respondents.	
NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT	THAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING
EACH RESPONDENT	HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER
The Securities Division ("Division") of	the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission"
alleges that respondents William Melvin Hawk	kins and Biomed Pharma Group, Inc. have engaged in
acts, practices, and transactions that constitute v	riolations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44
1801 et seq. ("Securities Act").	
	I.
JURI	ISDICTION
1. The Commission has jurisdict	ion over this matter pursuant to Article XV of th
Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.	
	II.
RES	PONDENTS
2 W"" M.L. H. L. (%H.	ulting") has been a resident of Arizona at all relevat

2. William Melvin Hawkins ("Hawkins") has been a resident of Arizona at all relevantimes.

ACC - Docket Control - Received 12/31/2019 12:47 PM ACC - Docket Control - Docketed 12/31/2019 1:48 PM

2

- From approximately October 1984 through December 1994, May 2000 through October 2002, and May 2003 through September 2005, Hawkins was registered with the Commission as a securities salesman in association with various securities dealers.
- 4. On February 1, 2007, the Commission issued an Order to Cease and Desist, Order of Restitution, Order of Revocation, Order for Administrative Penalties, and Consent to Same ("Consent Order") in the matter of William Melvin Hawkins and Meta Funding, LLC, Docket No. S-20470A-06-0531.
- In the Consent Order, the Commission found that Hawkins violated the Securities Act
   by selling unregistered securities in exchange for \$1,825,759.
  - Pursuant to the Consent Order, the Commission:
    - a) Ordered Hawkins to cease and desist from violating the Securities Act;
    - b) Revoked Hawkins' salesman registration;
    - Ordered Hawkins to pay \$1,284,900 in restitution and \$25,000 in administrative penalties;
    - d) Ordered Hawkins to refrain from selling securities in or from Arizona unless
       both he and the securities were registered with the Commission; and
    - e) Ordered that Hawkins could not exercise any control over an entity that offers or sells securities within or from Arizona, until he had fully paid the restitution and penalties imposed by the Consent Order.
- As of the date of this Notice, Hawkins has paid only \$128,666.82 of the restitution and penalties ordered by the Commission in the Consent Order.
- Hawkins has not been registered or licensed with the Commission in any capacity since his registration was revoked.
- Upon information and belief, Biomed Pharma Group, Inc. ("Biomed") is a corporation organized under the laws of the country of Panama in 2008.
  - Biomed has never been registered or licensed with the Commission in any capacity.

- Upon information and belief, Hawkins was a founder of Biomed and was a principal of Biomed at all relevant times.
  - 12. Hawkins and Biomed may be referred to collectively as "Respondents."

### III.

#### **FACTS**

- 13. From in or around April 2014 to March 2015, Hawkins and Biomed offered and sold securities in the form of shares of Biomed stock to at least one investor in exchange for at least \$283,630.
- 14. In February 2013, Hawkins began speaking with the investor at the funeral of the investor's mother.
- 15. Following the funeral, Hawkins and the investor continued to talk. At one point, Hawkins told the investor that he was working with a company in Panama that was going to produce human growth hormone.
- 16. Hawkins also told the investor that he had invested in the company, Biomed Pharma Group, Inc., and that his friends and family had also invested.
  - 17. Hawkins told the investor that Biomed still needed more investors.
- 18. Hawkins also told the investor that the return from Biomed's sale of human growth hormone would be "ridiculous" and would make enough for her to recoup her investment money and receive a percentage of sales while retaining her ownership stake.
- 19. On April 14, 2014, the investor entered into an "Investment Agreement" with Biomed whereby she agreed to invest \$325,000 in exchange for 6,957 shares of Biomed common stock.
- 20. Other than the voting rights associated with her shares of stock, the investor had no ability to control or manage the operations of Biomed.

- 21. The Investment Agreement was accompanied by an Addendum which stated, "The purpose of this Addendum is to attempt to provide [the investor] an additional degree of security in regard to the funds she is expending to purchase Biomed stock."
- 22. The Addendum specified that the investor would make an initial payment of \$165,000, and a second payment at the discretion of Hawkins after the first payment had been "exhausted."
- 23. The Addendum also stated, "Mel Hawkins, principal of Biomed, also commits to make a best efforts [sic] to repay [the investor] personally if liquidation of Biomed assets do [sic] not provide a full restitution to her of the dollars she has invested."
- 24. The Investment Agreement and Addendum were both executed by Hawkins on behalf of Biomed.
- 25. Respondents did not tell the investor that the Investment Agreement violated Hawkins' Consent Order because:
- a) Hawkins was prohibited from exercising any control over a company that offered or sold securities within or from Arizona; and
- b) Hawkins was prohibited from selling securities in Arizona unless he or the securities were registered or exempt from registration.
- 26. Respondents also did not tell the investor that Hawkins' ability to repay the investor could be affected by the more than \$1,000,000 in restitution he still owed at the time the Addendum was executed.
- Between April 14, 2014, and June 25, 2014, the investor invested a total of \$165,000
   in Biomed by wiring funds to its bank account in Panama.
- The investor continued to invest in Biomed through March 2015, investing a total of \$283,630.
- As of the date of this Notice, Hawkins has returned only \$40,000 of the investor's money.

1		IV.
2		VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841
3		(Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities)
4	30.	From on or about April 2014, Respondents offered or sold securities in the form of
5	stock within or	from Arizona.
6	31.	The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to Articles 6 or 7 of the
7	Securities Act.	
8	32.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841.
9		<b>V.</b>
10		VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842
11		(Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)
12	33.	Respondents offered or sold securities within or from Arizona while not registered as
13	dealers or sale	smen pursuant to Article 9 of the Securities Act.
14	34.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842.
15		VI.
16		VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991
17		(Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities)
18	35.	In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona, Respondent
19	directly or ind	irectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made untrue statement
20	of material fac	et or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to make the statement
21	made not mis	leading in light of the circumstances under which they were made; or (iii) engaged in
22	transactions, p	practices, or courses of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon
23	offerees and in	nvestors. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
24		a) Respondents represented Hawkins as a principal of Biomed to the investor, but
25:		did not tell the investor that Hawkins was prohibited from acting as a principal
26		

1	of Biomed because it was offering and selling securities within or from
2	Arizona;
3	b) Hawkins offered and sold Biomed stock to the investor, but did not tell the
4	investor that he was prohibited from doing so by the Consent Order; and
5	c) Respondents represented to the investor that Hawkins would repay her on a
6	best efforts basis if a liquidation of Biomed failed to fully repay her investment.
7	but did not tell her that Hawkins owed over \$1,000,000 in restitution at the
8	time.
9	36. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1991.
10	VII.
11	REQUESTED RELIEF
12	The Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:
13	Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act
14	pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;
15	2. Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from
16	Respondents' acts, practices, or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to
17	A.R.S. § 44-2032;
18	3. Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to five
19	thousand dollars (\$5,000) for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036;
20	Order that Respondent and Respondent Spouse be subject to any order of restitution
21	rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative action.
22	<ol> <li>Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.</li> </ol>
23	VIII.
24	HEARING OPPORTUNITY
25	Each respondent may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306
26	If a Despendent requests a hearing the requesting respondent must also answer this Notice.

 request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Kacie Cannon, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number (602) 542-3931, e-mail <a href="mailto:kcannon@azcc.gov">kcannon@azcc.gov</a>. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. Additional information about the administrative action procedure may be found at <a href="http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp">http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp</a>.

#### IX.

## ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent or a Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602) 542-3477 or on the Commission's Internet web site at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

Additionally, the answering respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a

copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Chris Nichols.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering respondent or respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this 31st day of December, 2019.

Wendy Coy

Assistant Director of Securi